



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/834,112	04/12/2001		Rick Allen Hamilton II	AUS920010173US1	3424
45993	7590	04/21/2005		EXAM	INER
IBM CORPORATION (RHF) C/O ROBERT H. FRANTZ				THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
P. O. BOX 23324				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OKLAHOMA CITY, OK 73123				3627	

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/834,112	HAMILTON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Marissa Thein	3627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a ref. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re eply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed (30) days will be considered timely. HS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29	June 2004.					
	his action is non-final.					
• • •	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims	4	•				
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdright 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.					
Application Papers		,				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a life	ents have been received. ents have been received in Apriority documents have been leau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	oplication No received in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) Characteristics of Paper No(s)/Mail Date						

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

Applicants' "Response to Office Action Under 37 CFR 1.111 and Amendment under 37 CFR 1.121" has been considered.

Applicants' response to claim 1 has overcome the Examiner's rejection of such claim under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Applicants' response to claim 9 has <u>not</u> overcome the Examiner's rejection of such claim under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-10, and 12 are amended. Claims 1-12 remain pending in this application.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The recitations in claim 1: "which are not

associated with a physical merchant facility", "wherein said physical merchant facility is actually nonexistent" and "such merchant facility is actually nonexistent"; and in claims 5 and 9: "which no physical retail facility exists", and "wherein the physical retail facility is nonexistent" are not described in the specification. The specification does disclose "online-only retailers" in page 4, line 16, which does not define a physical merchant facility is nonexistent because retailers and merchants store their inventory or products in a facility. For example, Amazon is an "online-only retailer" however, it products is stored in a warehouse which is a physical facility.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claims 1-12, the recitations in claim 1: "which are not associated with a physical merchant facility", "wherein said physical merchant facility is actually nonexistent" and "such merchant facility is actually nonexistent"; and in claims 5 and 9: "which no physical retail facility exists", and "wherein the physical retail facility is nonexistent" are unclear because there is no description in the specification.

Regarding claims 5 and 9, the recitation "such that an apparent relationship between an existent physical retail facility and said cyberstore is provided to said user wherein the physical retail facility is nonexistent" is unclear and vague. Does the facility

exist or not? The Examiner will interpret the claim as having a nonexistent physical retail facility.

Regarding claim 9, the claim recites "a shopping mall browser" which comprises a number of functionalities, it is unclear how "a mall browser" can encompass display and presenting as well as initializing and tracking functionalities.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,388,688 to Schileru-Key.

Regarding claims 1 and 5, Schileru-Key discloses a method and a computer readable medium of presenting information regarding products, supplier and offerors to users of a browsing device visiting a cybermall (interactive navigation and exploration of spatial environments, both real and virtual, col. 1, lines 55-57; virtual shopping mall and virtual stores, col. 12, lines 60-61), the cybermall comprising a collection of cyber stores (virtual shopping mall and virtual stores, col. 12, lines 60-61), the method and computer readable medium comprising the steps of:

displaying or provide to a user a portion of a computer display a map of a
 cybermall, the map having a coordinate system associated with positions within

Application/Control Number: 09/834,112

Art Unit: 3627

the cybermall (a map view window is initialized with intersections, paths; col. 5, lines 15-22; Figure 1 ref. no. 106 map; Figure 13 and Figure 15);

Page 5

- assigning a user an initial position having a set of coordinates within the
 cybermall (main view window 1110 shows the image frame associated with the
 starting intersection, a swell as any path choices 1130 col. 5, lines 19-21; when
 the user selects a choice, the path represented by that choice and any
 destination intersections are highlighted in map view window, col. 5, lines 23-26);
- presenting to the user at least one vector graphics multimedia object to the user
 according to the initial position coordinates, the multimedia objects being
 associated with one or more cyberstores such that an apparent relationship to an
 existent physical merchant facility is provided (col. 5, lines 23-35; col. 8, lines 3650; Figure 12);
- updating the initial position to a subsequent position responsive to a position
 change command from the user (when the user selects a choice, the path
 represented by that choice and any destination intersections are highlighted in
 map view window. The program plays the image sequence associated with the
 path, col. 5, lines 23-27); and
- presenting to the user at least one multimedia object to a customer indexed to
 the subsequent position, thereby providing the appearance to the user of
 movement through an existent merchant facility (Figure 18; col. 5, lines 26-35).
 However, Schileru-Key does not explicitly disclose the physical merchant facility

is actually nonexistent. The differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive

material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The steps of displaying, assigning, presenting, and updating would be performed regardless of the facility being nonexistent. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 f.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Furthermore, merchants or retailers being an "online-only retailer" or "brick and mortar" will always need physical facilities in order to store their inventory and products.

Thus, it would be impossible for merchants or retailers not to have a physical facility.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Schileru-Key to include the nonexistent physical merchant facility because such nonexistent physical merchant facility does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the facility does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 2-4, 6-8 and 10-12, Schileru-Key discloses presenting a visual image of a simulated mall or simulated store interior (virtual shopping mall and virtual stores, col. 12, lines 60-61; replicates a real life shopping experience; col. 12, lines 65-66); providing a customer-selectable hot spot (HotSpot) within the visual image (col. 5, lines 6-8; col. 5, lines 23-30); updating the customer's position responsive to selection of the hot spot (col. 5, lines 27-35); and presenting a sound clip (audio clip) representative

of simulated background sound within a mall or store interior (col. 4, lines 23-25; col. 5, lines 3-5; col. 5, lines 27-30).

Regarding claim 9, Schileru-Key discloses a shopping mall browser comprising: a mall map display on a portion of a web browser for shopping a user a virtual geographical organization of a cybermall contents, the map having a coordinate system associated with positions within the cybermall, the cybermall comprising a collection of cyberstores, each cyberstores representing an online-only merchant for which no physical retail facility exists (a map view window is initialized with intersections, paths; col. 5, lines 15-22; Figure 1 ref. no. 106 map; Figure 13 and Figure 15); a user position initializer for assigning an initial set of coordinates within the cybermall (main view window 1110 shows the image frame associated with the starting intersection, a swell as any path choices 1130 col. 5, lines 19-21; when the user selects a choice, the path represented by that choice and any destination intersections are highlighted in map view window, col. 5, lines 23-26); a position tracker for updating the initial position to a subsequent position responsive to a position change commend from the user (when the user selects a choice, the path represented by that choice and any destination intersections are highlighted in map view window. The program plays the image sequence associated with the path, col. 5, lines 23-27); and a multimedia object presenter for presenting to the user on the web browser at least one multimedia object including at least one vector graphics image of a cyberstore indexed to the initial position or the subsequent position such that an apparent relationship between a

physical retail facility and the cyberstore is provided (col. 5, lines 23-35; col. 8, lines 36-50; Figure 12; Figure 18).

However, Schileru-Key does not explicitly disclose no physical retail facility exists and the physical merchant facility is actually nonexistent. The differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The steps of displaying, assigning, presenting, and updating would be performed regardless of the facility being nonexistent. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 f.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Furthermore, merchants or retailers being an "online-only retailer" or "brick and mortar" will always need physical facilities in order to store their inventory and products.

Thus, it would be impossible for merchants or retailers not to have a physical facility.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Schileru-Key to include the nonexistent physical merchant facility because such nonexistent physical merchant facility does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the facility does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0056377 to Kondoh et al. discloses a set-up of shops and a shopping method in a cyber mall on the Internet.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the (571) 272 - 6764 examiner should be directed to Marissa Their whose telephone number is 703-305
-5246. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's (641) 272- 6788 supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

H151.5

1115/05

Application/Control Number: 09/834,112 Page 10

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

mtot April 15, 2005

JAMES MCCLELLAN PRIMARY EXAMINER 4/15/05